

**New Business Item 12-04**

Introduced 8/24/12

Approved 8/24/12

**TITLE: University of Phoenix Report Regarding Conditions to the Elementary Education K-6 Undergraduate Teacher Education Program**

---

The Hawaii Teacher Standards Board accepts the attached report from the University of Phoenix as required in NBI 11-35, approved on December 9, 2011:

The following condition must be met by the University of Phoenix:

- Submit a report to the HTSB no later than June, 2012 providing evidence that the unit has done the following:
  - The unit shall submit evidence that the multiple co-mingled standards have been eliminated from the assessment rubrics so that resulting data can be disaggregated by standard.
  - The unit shall report on what measures will be taken to be able to determine candidate mastery of the standards in the assessment rubrics.

**Submitted by:** Terry Lynn Holck

**Referred to:** Teacher Education Committee



## Hawaii Campus Report to the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board

### New Business Item 11-35

#### **TITLE: Provisional Approval of the University of Phoenix-Hawaii Elementary Education K-6 Undergraduate Teacher Education Program**

---

The Hawaii Teacher Standards Board approves the following recommendation of its State Approved Teacher Education (SATE) Program Review Team for the Provisional Approval of the University of Phoenix Elementary Education K-6 Undergraduate Teacher Education Program :

- The program is granted provisional approval with conditions, effective December 9, 2011 through December 31, 2014.
- Candidates completing this program may be recommended for licensure in Elementary Education K-6 after meeting all program requirements.

The following condition must be met by the University of Phoenix :

- Submit a report to the HTSB no later than June, 2012 providing evidence that the unit has done the following:
  - The unit shall submit evidence that the multiple co-mingled standards have been eliminated from the assessment rubrics so that resulting data can be disaggregated by standard. – ***Please see assessment rubrics with criteria aligned to single HTSB standards***
  - The unit shall report on what measures will be taken to be able to determine candidate mastery of the standards in the assessment rubrics. - ***Please see explanation of assessment system, presented on page 25.***
- The unit must explain any changes to this program in the unit's Annual Report due each year to HTSB by December 31.

A review of this program shall be conducted by a national accrediting body approved by the US Department of Education no later than three years following implementation. Verification of this accreditation must be submitted to the HTSB to be eligible for full SATE approval.

A letter shall be sent to the University of Phoenix on behalf of the Board to communicate this action.

## SECTION II— ASSESSMENTS AND RELATED DATA

Name of Assessment		Type or Form of Assessment	Evaluation Rubric	Scoring Guide #
1	<i>Content Knowledge</i>	<b>Praxis II Content Exam</b>	<b>Praxis II: Required passing of test prior to student teaching</b>	1A
2	<i>Pedagogical &amp; Professional Knowledge</i>	<b>Methods Course Integrated Unit Plan</b>	<b>RDG 410– Elementary Methods: Reading / Language Arts</b>	2A
3	<i>Ability to Plan Instruction</i>	<b>Methods Course Instructional Unit Plan</b>	<b>EED 415– Elementary Methods: Mathematics</b>	3A
4	<i>Assessment of Student Teaching</i>	<b>Student Teaching Evaluation</b>	<b>Mid-term and End of student teaching</b>	4A
5	<i>Assessment of candidate effect on student learning</i>	<b>Teacher Work Sample</b>	<b>During student teaching practicum</b>	5A
6	<i>Dispositions Assessment</i>	<b>Self-Assessment of Dispositions</b>	<b>During EDU/320 (Earlier course in program) &amp; EED/490 (Student teaching seminar)</b>	6A
7	<i>Classroom Management</i>	<b>Classroom Management Plan</b>	<b>EDU/320</b>	7A

# *PRAXIS II Elementary Content Exam*

*[Assessment Evidence of Content Knowledge –HTSB Standard 5]*

---

## *Assessment 1*

The Praxis II Content Exam for Elementary candidates (tests 0014 or 5014) is designed for prospective teachers of children in primary through upper elementary grades, and is a licensure requirement of the Hawaii Teachers Standards Board. The test is in a multiple-choice question format and focuses on four major subject areas: reading/language arts (including foundations of reading, writing, and communication skills); mathematics (including mathematical processes, numeration, geometry, algebraic concepts, and data organization); social studies (including geography, US and World history, government and citizenship, and economics); and science (including earth, life, and physical science and scientific processes and inquiry).

University of Phoenix MAED candidates are required to successfully pass Praxis II Elementary content before they are scheduled for student teaching seminars and the practicum. If a candidate does not pass Praxis II, he or she is temporarily withdrawn from the program until the candidate can provide passing scores for Praxis II.

## *PRAXIS II Elementary Content Exam      Scoring Guide # 1A*

Required Test	Test Code	Qualifying Score
<a href="#">Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (calculator allowed)</a> (paper)	0014	153
or		
<a href="#">Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (calculator allowed)</a> (computer)	5014	153

**RDG/410 INTEGRATED UNIT****EVALUATION RUBRIC****SCORING GUIDE 2A**

**Note:** An overall rating of Proficient (3) is required on this artifact.

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>1 UNSATISFACTORY</b>	<b>2 BASIC</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>4 ADVANCED</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
Overview of the Unit (Unit Title, Unit Focus, Unit Length, and Unit Goals) <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 5]</b>	Some unit components are not included.  The unit components are not appropriate for the grade level.	Unit components are not described clearly.  Only some components are appropriate for the grade level.	Unit components are adequately described.  The components are mostly appropriate for the grade level.	Unit components are described in detail.  The components are appropriate for the grade level.	
Bibliography <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 5]</b>	A bibliography is not included.	Bibliography includes a mix of relevant and irrelevant sources.  References within the bibliography are not presented in APA format or with significant APA errors.	Bibliography includes mostly relevant sources.  References within the bibliography are presented in APA format with minimal errors.	Bibliography includes a variety of relevant sources.  References within the bibliography are consistently presented in APA format.	
Content Knowledge <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 5]</b>	The content covered in the lesson plan is not accurate. There is no integrated content.  The content does not align to the standards and objectives.	Very little content covered in the lesson plan is accurate. There is little integrated content.  Content is minimally aligned to the standards and objectives.	Most of the content covered in the lesson plan is accurate and somewhat integrated.  Content is aligned with the standards and objectives.	Content covered in the lesson plan is accurate, integrated, and current.  Content is targeted to the standards and objectives and includes the major ideas that are to be taught to meet the objectives.	
Objectives <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 6]</b>	Objectives are not stated or objectives are stated but do not align to the activities.  None of the objectives are written utilizing Bloom's taxonomy to reflect various levels of thinking.  None of the objectives are measurable.	Objectives are stated, but only a few align to the activities.  Few of the objectives are written utilizing Bloom's taxonomy.  Few of the objectives are measurable.	Objectives are stated and most are appropriately aligned to the activities.  Most of the objectives are written utilizing Bloom's Taxonomy.  Most of the objectives are measurable.	Objectives are clearly stated and appropriately aligned to the activities.  Objectives are written utilizing Bloom's taxonomy.  Objectives are measurable.	
Standards <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 5]</b>	Standards are not identified or are not correctly linked to lesson plan/unit content.  Standards are not aligned with objectives.	Standards are identified but few are correctly linked to lesson plan/unit content.  Few of the standards are aligned with objectives.	Standards are identified and most are correctly linked to lesson plan/unit content.  Most of the standards are aligned with objectives.	Standards are identified and correctly aligned to lesson plan/unit content.  Standards are clearly aligned with objectives.	

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>1 UNSATISFACTORY</b>	<b>2 BASIC</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>4 ADVANCED</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
Instructional Approach <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 6]</b>	Instructional approach is not identified. No activities are aligned to instructional approach. There is no attempt to check for student understanding.	Instructional approach identified is not appropriate for the lesson. A few activities align to selected instructional approach. Instruction does not include a description of how teacher will check for student understanding.	Instructional approach identified is mostly appropriate for the lesson. Most activities align to selected instructional approach. Instruction includes a description of how teacher will check for student understanding.	Various instructional approaches identified are appropriate for the lesson. Activities align to the selected instructional approaches. Instruction includes a description of how teacher will consistently check for student understanding.	
Activities <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 7]</b>	Activities do not reflect consideration for learning styles and/or special needs accommodations. Activities do not incorporate teacher/student use of technology.	Activities reflect little consideration for learning styles and/or special needs accommodations. Activities make limited use of technology for teacher or students.	Activities reflect adequate consideration for learning styles and/or special needs accommodations. Activities incorporate technology adequately for both the teacher and students.	Activities reflect comprehensive consideration for learning styles and/or special needs accommodations. Activities incorporate technology in a variety of ways for both the teacher and the students.	
Assessment – Performance-Based Assessment and Rubric <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 8]</b>	Performance-based assessment and rubric are not included.	Performance-based assessment does not connect with lesson objective(s) and/or the content taught. Performance-based assessment does not require students' active participation. The performance-based assessment identified is not an appropriate tool for skill(s) being assessed. Rubric provides little structure and/or unclear descriptors for measuring student performance.	Performance-based assessment generally connects with lesson objective(s) and the content taught. Performance-based assessment somewhat limits students' active participation. The performance-based assessment identified is an adequate tool for skill(s) being assessed. Rubric provides adequate structure and descriptors for measuring student performance.	Performance-based assessment clearly connects with lesson objective(s) and the content taught. Performance-based assessment requires students to be active participants. The performance based assessment identified is an appropriate tool for skill(s) being assessed. Rubric provides a clear structure and descriptors for measuring student performance.	

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>1 UNSATISFACTORY</b>	<b>2 BASIC</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>4 ADVANCED</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
Assessments – Quiz and Unit Test  <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 8]</b>	Quizzes and/or unit test are not provided.	Format and length of the quizzes and unit test are not appropriate for student population  The quizzes and unit test utilize question types that are not appropriate for the student population and do not include higher level thinking questions.	Format and length of the quizzes and unit test are generally appropriate for student population  The quizzes and unit test utilize question types that are generally appropriate for the student population and include higher level thinking questions.	Format and length of the quizzes and unit test are appropriate for student population  The quizzes and unit test utilize question types that are appropriate for the student population and consistently include higher level thinking questions.	
Organization <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 6]</b>	The lessons/unit lack a logical sequence/progression in order to meet objectives.	There is minimal logical sequence/progression to the lessons/unit in order to meet objectives.	There is an evident logical sequence/progression to the lessons/unit in order to meet objectives.	There is an evident and comprehensive logical sequence/progression to the lessons/unit in order to meet objectives	
Mechanics <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 4]</b>	Spelling and grammar errors are excessive and interfere with understanding of the instructional unit.	Spelling and grammar errors are numerous and somewhat interfere with understanding of the instructional unit.	Spelling and grammar errors are minimal and do not interfere with understanding of the instructional unit.	Spelling and grammar errors are not evident and do not interfere with understanding of the instructional unit.	

**EED/415 INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT****EVALUATION RUBRIC****SCORING GUIDE 3A**

**Note:** An overall rating of Proficient (3) is required on this artifact.

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>1 UNSATISFACTORY</b>	<b>2 BASIC</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>4 ADVANCED</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
Overview of the Unit (Unit Title, Unit Focus, Unit Length, and Unit Goals) <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 5]</b>	Some unit components are not included.  The unit components are not appropriate for the grade level.	Unit components are not described clearly.  Only some components are appropriate for the grade level.	Unit components are adequately described.  The components are mostly appropriate for the grade level.	Unit components are described in detail.  The components are appropriate for the grade level.	
Bibliography  <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 5]</b>	A bibliography is not included.	Bibliography includes a mix of relevant and irrelevant sources.  References within the bibliography are not presented in APA format or with significant APA errors.	Bibliography includes mostly relevant sources.  References within the bibliography are presented in APA format with minimal errors.	Bibliography includes a variety of relevant sources.  References within the bibliography are consistently presented in APA format.	
Content Knowledge  <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 5]</b>	The content covered in the lesson plan is not accurate.  The content does not align to the standards and objectives.	Very little content covered in the lesson plan is accurate.  Content is minimally aligned to the standards and objectives.	Most of the content covered in the lesson plan is accurate.  Content is aligned with the standards and objectives.	Content covered in the lesson plan is accurate and current.  Content is targeted to the standards and objectives and includes the major ideas that are to be taught to meet the objectives.	
Objectives  <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 6]</b>	Objectives are not stated or objectives are stated but do not align to the activities.  None of the objectives are written utilizing Bloom's taxonomy to reflect various levels of thinking.  None of the objectives are measurable.	Objectives are stated, but only a few align to the activities.  Few of the objectives are written utilizing Bloom's taxonomy.  Few of the objectives are measurable.	Objectives are stated and most are appropriately aligned to the activities.  Most of the objectives are written utilizing Bloom's Taxonomy.  Most of the objectives are measurable.	Objectives are clearly stated and appropriately aligned to the activities.  Objectives are written utilizing Bloom's taxonomy.  Objectives are measurable.	
Standards  <b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 5]</b>	Standards are not identified or are not correctly linked to lesson plan/unit content.  Standards are not aligned with objectives.	Standards are identified but few are correctly linked to lesson plan/unit content.  Few of the standards are aligned with objectives.	Standards are identified and most are correctly linked to lesson plan/unit content.  Most of the standards are aligned with objectives.	Standards are identified and correctly aligned to lesson plan/unit content.  Standards are clearly aligned with objectives.	



<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>1 UNSATISFACTORY</b>	<b>2 BASIC</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>4 ADVANCED</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
<p>Instructional Approach</p> <p><b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 6]</b></p>	<p>Instructional approach is not identified.</p> <p>No activities are aligned to instructional approach.</p> <p>There is no attempt to check for student understanding.</p>	<p>Instructional approach identified is not appropriate for the lesson.</p> <p>A few activities align to selected instructional approach.</p> <p>Instruction does not include a description of how teacher will check for student understanding.</p>	<p>Instructional approach identified is mostly appropriate for the lesson.</p> <p>Most activities align to selected instructional approach.</p> <p>Instruction includes a description of how teacher will check for student understanding.</p>	<p>Various instructional approaches identified are appropriate for the lesson.</p> <p>Activities align to the selected instructional approaches.</p> <p>Instruction includes a description of how teacher will consistently check for student understanding.</p>	
<p>Activities</p> <p><b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 7]</b></p>	<p>Activities do not reflect consideration for learning styles and/or special needs accommodations.</p> <p>Activities do not incorporate teacher/student use of technology.</p>	<p>Activities reflect little consideration for learning styles and/or special needs accommodations.</p> <p>Activities make limited use of technology for teacher or students.</p>	<p>Activities reflect adequate consideration for learning styles and/or special needs accommodations.</p> <p>Activities incorporate technology adequately for both the teacher and students.</p>	<p>Activities reflect comprehensive consideration for learning styles and/or special needs accommodations.</p> <p>Activities incorporate technology in a variety of ways for both the teacher and the students.</p>	
<p>Assessment – Performance-Based Assessment and Rubric</p> <p><b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 8]</b></p>	<p>Performance-based assessment and rubric are not included.</p>	<p>Performance-based assessment does not connect with lesson objective(s) and/or the content taught.</p> <p>Performance-based assessment does not require students' active participation.</p> <p>The performance-based assessment identified is not an appropriate tool for skill(s) being assessed.</p> <p>Rubric provides little structure and/or unclear descriptors for measuring student performance.</p>	<p>Performance-based assessment generally connects with lesson objective(s) and the content taught.</p> <p>Performance-based assessment somewhat limits students' active participation.</p> <p>The performance-based assessment identified is an adequate tool for skill(s) being assessed.</p> <p>Rubric provides adequate structure and descriptors for measuring student performance.</p>	<p>Performance-based assessment clearly connects with lesson objective(s) and the content taught.</p> <p>Performance-based assessment requires students to be active participants.</p> <p>The performance based assessment identified is an appropriate tool for skill(s) being assessed.</p> <p>Rubric provides a clear structure and descriptors for measuring student performance.</p>	

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>1 UNSATISFACTORY</b>	<b>2 BASIC</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>4 ADVANCED</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
<p>Assessments – Quiz and Unit Test</p> <p><b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 8]</b></p>	Quizzes and/or unit test are not provided.	<p>Format and length of the quizzes and unit test are not appropriate for student population</p> <p>The quizzes and unit test utilize question types that are not appropriate for the student population and do not include higher level thinking questions.</p>	<p>Format and length of the quizzes and unit test are generally appropriate for student population</p> <p>The quizzes and unit test utilize question types that are generally appropriate for the student population and include higher level thinking questions.</p>	<p>Format and length of the quizzes and unit test are appropriate for student population</p> <p>The quizzes and unit test utilize question types that are appropriate for the student population and consistently include higher level thinking questions.</p>	
<p>Organization</p> <p><b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 6]</b></p>	The lessons/unit lack a logical sequence/progression in order to meet objectives.	There is minimal logical sequence/progression to the lessons/unit in order to meet objectives.	There is an evident logical sequence/progression to the lessons/unit in order to meet objectives.	There is an evident and comprehensive logical sequence/progression to the lessons/unit in order to meet objectives	
<p>Mechanics</p> <p><b>[Aligned with HTSB Standard 4]</b></p>	Spelling and grammar errors are excessive and interfere with understanding of the instructional unit.	Spelling and grammar errors are numerous and somewhat interfere with understanding of the instructional unit.	Spelling and grammar errors are minimal and do not interfere with understanding of the instructional unit.	Spelling and grammar errors are not evident and do not interfere with understanding of the instructional unit.	

*Faculty Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers are required to use this Student Teaching Evaluation form for the final evaluation.*

The purpose of this Student Teaching Evaluation is to document the student teacher's areas of strength and areas in need of improvement within each of the four domains identified in the Teacher Education Program Standards. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher to use the Student Teaching Evaluation form as a means to document and to communicate the student teacher's instructional performance and development of professional dispositions throughout the duration of the student teaching experience.

**Use the following criteria to evaluate the student teacher within each of the four domains:**

**Advanced:** The advanced student teacher functions at a higher level; his/her total understanding of underlying concepts is apparent; students are highly motivated and engaged to the level they begin to assume responsibility for their own learning; all common themes are distinguishable and appropriate.

**Proficient:** The proficient student teacher is considered to be "capable," understands the underlying concepts and consistently implements them well; student engagement occurs frequently and common themes are clearly distinguishable.

**Developing:** The developing student teacher understands some of the underlying concepts, but is unsuccessful or inconsistent in the application of the elements; some student engagement occurs and common themes may begin to emerge.

**Unsatisfactory:** The "unsatisfactory" student teacher is working at a fundamental level, without an understanding of underlying concepts; there are no common themes and students are not engaged in the learning process; this person is below the licensing standard of "do no harm." (Any unsatisfactory remarks will be reviewed in the context of the student's overall performance during the student teaching experience. The student may be required to repeat the student teaching experience.)

**Note:** Student teachers who are removed from a placement at the request of a school district administrator will be withdrawn from class and will be issued a grade of F by their faculty member in the respective student teaching seminar course.

Faculty Supervisors should outline and discuss the grading criteria used to evaluate the student teaching practicum grade with the student teacher. Faculty supervisors should use a holistic approach in which they consider a variety of components when determining the student teaching practicum grade (e.g., attendance, weekly communication, lesson plans, dispositions, attendance at extracurricular activities, student teaching evaluation forms, Teacher Work Sample development/implementation). The faculty supervisor and cooperating teacher evaluation forms should only be used as part of the student teaching practicum grade issued.

The Faculty Supervisor is required to submit a final student teaching grade. The grade will be based on 50 points and will be determined using the scale below:

**Student Teaching Points Grading Scale:**

A	48 – 50	C	36 – 37
A-	46 – 47	C-	35
B+	44 – 45	D+	34
B	42 – 43	D	33
B-	40 – 41	F	32 and below
C+	38 – 39		

<b>DOMAIN ONE: PLANNING AND PREPARATION</b>	No Chance to Observe	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Proficient	Advanced
Demonstrates knowledge of content. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 5]</b>					
Demonstrates knowledge of pedagogy. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 6]</b>					
Applies skills and knowledge that reflect current research and best practices. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 5]</b>					
Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge through planning of appropriate and effective instructional strategies. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 7]</b>					
Analyzes student diversity to guide appropriate instructional activities. <b>[HTSB STANDARDS 3]</b>					
Demonstrates knowledge of variety of resources and technology. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 5]</b>					
Develops instructional activities that are aligned with national and/or state standards. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 6]</b>					
Develops a variety of formative and summative assessments and assessment criteria to guide instruction. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 8]</b>					
Uses results of formative assessments to create measurable objectives tied to student outcomes. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 8]</b>					
Applies assessment results to plan instruction for individuals, groups, and diverse learners. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 1]</b>					
Narrative:					

<b>DOMAIN TWO: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>	No Chance to Observe	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Proficient	Advanced
Creates a learning community/classroom that is safe and accessible. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 2]</b>					
Maintains interactions that are polite and respectful. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 2]</b>					
Establishes, implements, and monitors clear standards of conduct in order to create a smoothly functioning learning community. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 2]</b>					
Deals effectively with inappropriate student conduct and/or serious discipline problems. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 2]</b>					
Promotes shared decision-making among students. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 1]</b>					
Promotes self-directed learning of students. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 1]</b>					
Organizes and manages tasks for individuals and groups. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 2]</b>					
Manages instructional transitions. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 4]</b>					
Manages classroom materials and supplies. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 2]</b>					
Establishes systems for non-instructional activities. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 4]</b>					
Narrative:          					

<b>DOMAIN THREE: INSTRUCTION</b>	No Chance to Observe	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Proficient	Advanced
Uses appropriate resources and materials, including technology, to communicate with and engage students. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 6]</b>					
Uses appropriate resources and materials, including technology, for effective instruction. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 6]</b>					
Uses vocabulary and communication styles appropriate for diverse populations. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 4]</b>					
Creates and implements lessons, activities, and assessments that are appropriately aligned with content and with national and/or state standards. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 6]</b>					
Creates and implements lessons, activities, and assessments that are well paced and cognitively appropriate for the student population. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 7]</b>					
Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge through effective teaching and assessment. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 5]</b>					
Uses questions and discussions to incorporate students' multiple perspectives, including personal, family, community experiences, and cultural norms. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 1]</b>					
Identifies and uses appropriate services, technology, and other resources to meet support learning needs of diverse and exceptional learners. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 3]</b>					
Provides high quality feedback in a timely manner. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 4]</b>					
Models good verbal and written skills. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 4]</b>					
Narrative:					

<b>DOMAIN FOUR: THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR</b>	No Chance to Observe	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Proficient	Advanced
Accepts constructive criticism and implements specific suggestions. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 9]</b>					
Models appropriate dress and grooming. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 9]</b>					
Demonstrates positive and collaborative relationships with colleagues and the larger school community. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 10]</b>					
Demonstrates a nurturing and caring attitude toward students. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 2]</b>					
Creates opportunities for parent involvement. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 10]</b>					
Demonstrates professional demeanor in the school and community. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 9]</b>					
Participates in school community activities (e.g., PTA, board meetings, bus duty, and playground duty). <b>[HTSB STANDARD 10]</b>					
Maintains legal and ethical principles and standards. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 9]</b>					
Engages in professional practices that promote lifelong learning. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 9]</b>					
Actively reflects on instructional practices to improve student learning. <b>[HTSB STANDARD 9]</b>					
Narrative:					

**TEACHING PROCESS: CONTEXTUAL FACTORS (TWS Standard # 1)**

The teacher uses information about the learning/teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and objectives, plan instruction, and assess learning.

*Related University of Phoenix Program Standards (Domain and Sub-domain)*

<p><i>Domain One: Planning and Preparation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1A: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</li> <li>• 1B: Instructional Planning and Resources</li> <li>• 1C: Instructional Design</li> </ul>	<p><i>Domain Three: Instruction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3B: Student Engagement</li> <li>• 3C: Diversity</li> </ul>
--	---

**Note: An overall rating of 2.5 is required on the entire Teacher Work Sample.**

	<b>1</b> <b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Basic</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Proficient</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Knowledge of Community, District, School, and Classroom Factors</b> [HTSB STANDARD 1 ]	Teacher displays minimal or irrelevant knowledge of the characteristics of the community, district, school, and classroom.	Teacher displays some knowledge of the characteristics of the community, district, school, and classroom that are relevant to the learning goals and objectives.	Teacher displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, district, school, and classroom that are relevant to the learning goals and objectives.	
<b>Knowledge of Characteristics of Students</b> [HTSB STANDARD 1 ]	Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities)	Teacher displays some knowledge of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that are relevant to the learning goals and objectives.	Teacher displays a comprehensive knowledge of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that are relevant to the learning goals and objectives.	
<b>Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning</b> [HTSB STANDARD 3 ]	Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities)	Teacher displays a general knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities) that are relevant to the learning goals and objectives.	Teacher displays comprehensive knowledge of the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities) that are relevant to the learning goals and objectives.	
<b>Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning</b> [HTSB STANDARD 6]	Teacher displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students' skills and prior knowledge.	Teacher displays some knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that are relevant to the learning goals and objectives.	Teacher displays comprehensive knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that are relevant to the learning goals and objectives.	
<b>Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment</b> [HTSB STANDARD 3 ]	Teacher does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications.	Teacher provides some implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	Teacher provides appropriate implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	

**COMMENTS:**



## TEACHING PROCESS: LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (TWS Standard # 2)

The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate learning goals and objectives.

### University of Phoenix Program Standards (Domain and Sub-domain)

<b>Domain One: Planning and Preparation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1A: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</li> <li>• 1B: Instructional Planning and Resources</li> <li>• 1C: Instructional Design</li> </ul>	<b>Domain Three: Instruction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. • 3B: Student Engagement</li> </ul>
---	--

**Note: An overall rating of 2.5 is required on the entire Teacher Work Sample.**

	<b>1 Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2 Basic</b>	<b>3 Proficient</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Significance, Challenge, and Variety</b> [HTSB STANDARD 7]	Goals and objectives reflect only one type or level of learning.	Goals and objectives reflect several types or levels of learning.	Goals and objectives reflect several types or levels of learning and reflect high expectations for student understanding and application of knowledge.	
<b>Clarity</b> [HTSB STANDARD 5]	Goals and objectives are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes.	Some of the goals and objectives are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	Most of the goals and objectives are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	
<b>Appropriateness for Students</b> [HTSB STANDARD 1]	Goals and objectives are not developmentally appropriate and do not reflect the needs of students.	Some goals and objectives are developmentally appropriate; many goals and objectives do not meet the needs of students.	Goals and objectives are developmentally appropriate and meet the needs of most students.	
<b>Alignment with National, State, or Local Standards</b> [HTSB STANDARD 5]	Goals and objectives are not aligned with national, state, or local standards.	Some goals and objectives are aligned with national, state, or local standards.	Most of the goals and objectives are explicitly aligned with national, state, or local standards.	
<b>COMMENTS:</b>				

### TEACHING PROCESS: ASSESSMENT PLAN (TWS Standard # 3)

The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals and objectives to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.

#### *University of Phoenix Program Standards (Domain and Sub-domain)*

<i>Domain One: Planning and Preparation</i>	<i>Domain Three: Instruction</i>
• 1D: Assessment	1. • 3C: Diversity

**Note: An overall rating of 2.5 is required on the entire Teacher Work Sample.**

	<b>1 Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2 Basic</b>	<b>3 Proficient</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Alignment with Learning Goals and Objectives and Instruction</b> [HTSB STANDARD 8]	Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning goals and objectives or lack cognitive complexity.	Some of the learning goals and objectives are assessed through the assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals and objectives in content and cognitive complexity.	Most of the learning goals and objectives are assessed through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals and objectives in content and cognitive complexity.	
<b>Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance</b> [HTSB STANDARD 8]	The assessments contain no clear criteria or standards for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals and objectives.	Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are not clear or are not explicitly linked to the learning goals and objectives.	Assessment criteria and standards are clear and are explicitly linked to the learning goals and objectives.	
<b>Multiple Modes and Approaches</b> [HTSB STANDARD 8]	The assessment plan includes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction.	The assessment plan includes multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge, skills, and reasoning ability.	The assessment plan includes multiple assessment modes (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence.	
<b>Technical Soundness</b> [HTSB STANDARD 8]	Assessments are not valid; scoring procedures are absent or inaccurate; items or prompts are poorly written; directions and procedures are confusing to students.	Assessments appear to have "face validity" for measuring the learning goals and objectives; scoring procedures are explained; most items or prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students.	Information regarding the validity of the assessments for measuring the learning goals and objectives is provided; scoring procedures are clearly explained and reliable; items and prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students.	
<b>Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students</b> [HTSB STANDARD 3]	Teacher does not adapt assessments to meet the individual needs of students or these assessments are inappropriate.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of some students.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of most students.	
<b>COMMENTS:</b>				

### TEACHING PROCESS: DESIGN FOR INSTRUCTION (TWS Standard # 4)

The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals and objectives, student characteristics and needs, and the specific learning context.

#### *Related University of Phoenix Program Standards (Domain and Sub-domain)*

<b>Domain One: Planning and Preparation</b> 1. • 1A: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy 2. • 1B: Instructional Planning and Resources 3. • 1C: Instructional Design	<b>Domain Three: Instruction</b> 1. • 3B: Student Engagement
---	---

**Note:** An overall rating of 2.5 is required on the entire Teacher Work Sample.

	<b>1</b> <b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Basic</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Proficient</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Alignment with Learning Goals and Objectives</b> [HTSB STANDARD 6]	Few lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals and objectives. Few learning activities, assignments, and resources are aligned with learning goals and objectives. Not all learning goals and objectives are covered in the design.	Most lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals and objectives. Most learning activities, assignments, and resources are aligned with learning goals and objectives. Most learning goals and objectives are covered in the design.	All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals and objectives. All learning activities, assignments, and resources are aligned with learning goals and objectives. All learning goals and objectives are covered in the design.	
<b>Accurate Representation of Content</b> [HTSB STANDARD 5]	Teacher's use of content appears to contain numerous inaccuracies. Content seems to be viewed more as isolated skills and facts rather than as part of a larger conceptual structure.	Teacher's use of content appears to be mainly accurate. Shows awareness of the big ideas or structure of the discipline.	Teacher's use of content appears to be accurate. Focus of the content is congruent with the big ideas or structure of the discipline. Where appropriate, teacher makes connections from the content to other parts of the content or to other content areas.	
<b>Lesson and Unit Structure</b> [HTSB STANDARD 6]	The unit and lesson have little recognizable structure.	The unit and lesson have structure. Most lessons, activities, and assignments are coherent parts of this structure and appear to be useful in moving the student towards achieving the learning goals and objectives.	The unit and lesson have a clearly defined structure. All lessons, activities, and assignments are coherent parts of this structure and appear to be useful in moving the student towards achieving the learning goals and objectives.	
<b>Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments, and Resources</b> [HTSB STANDARD 7]	There is little focus on variety of instruction, activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource.	Some variety in instruction, activities, assignments, or resources.	Design includes variety across instruction, activities, assignments, and resources used.	

<b>Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments, and Resources</b> [HTSB STANDARD 3]	Instruction has not been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Activities and assignments do not appear productive and appropriate for each student.	Some instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Some activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.	Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Most activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.	
<b>Use of Technology</b> [HTSB STANDARD 5]	Teacher does not use technology in instructional delivery and does not provide opportunities for students to use technology OR technology is inappropriately used.	Teacher uses technology appropriately in instructional delivery but does not integrate technology into student learning activities. Technology does not make a significant contribution to teaching and learning	Teacher integrates appropriate technology for teaching and learning.	
<b>COMMENTS:</b>				

### TEACHING PROCESS: INSTRUCTIONAL DECISION-MAKING (TWS Standard #5)

The teacher uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.

#### *Related University of Phoenix Program Standards (Domain and Sub-domain)*

<i>Domain One: Planning and Preparation</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1A: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</li> <li>• 1D: Assessment</li> </ul>	<i>Domain Three: Instruction</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3B: Student Engagement</li> <li>• 3C: Diversity</li> </ul>
---	--

**Note:** An overall rating of 2.5 is required on the entire Teacher Work Sample.

	<b>1</b> <b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Basic</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Proficient</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Sound Professional Practice</b> [HTSB STANDARD 6]	Many instructional decisions are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound.	Instructional decisions are mostly appropriate, but some decisions are not pedagogically sound.	Most instructional decisions are pedagogically sound (i.e. they are likely to lead to student learning).	
<b>Adjustments Based on Analysis of Student Learning</b> [HTSB STANDARD 3]	Teacher treats class as "one plan fits all" with no adjustments.	Some adjustments of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are not based on the analysis of student learning, and obvious opportunities are missed.	Appropriate adjustments of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs. These adjustments are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance.	
<b>Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals and Objectives</b> [HTSB STANDARD 6]	Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals and objectives.	Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals and objectives.	Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals and objectives.	
<b>COMMENTS:</b>				

**TEACHING PROCESS: ANALYSIS OF LEARNING RESULTS (TSW Standard # 6)**

The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.

*Related University of Phoenix Program Standards (Domain and Sub-domain)*

<b>Domain One: Planning and Preparation</b> • 1B: Instructional Planning and Resources • 1C: Instructional Design • 1D: Assessment	<b>Domain Three: Instruction</b> • 3A: Communication • 3B: Student Engagement	<b>Domain Four: The Professional Educator</b> • 4B: Professionalism • 4C: Reflection
---	---	--

**Note: An overall rating of 2.5 is required on the entire Teacher Work Sample.**

	<b>1 Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2 Basic</b>	<b>3 Proficient</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation</b> [HTSB STANDARD 4]	Presentation is not clear and accurate (does not accurately reflect the data).	Presentation is understandable and contains few errors.	Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation.	
<b>Alignment with Learning Goals and Objectives</b> [HTSB STANDARD 6]	Analysis of student learning lacks congruence with learning goals and objectives.	Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and objectives, but fails to provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals and objectives.	Analysis is aligned with learning goals and objectives and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals and objectives.	
<b>Presentation of Aggregated and Disaggregated Data</b> [HTSB STANDARD 8]	Presentation fails to include aggregated (whole group) and disaggregated (subgroup and individual student) data.	Presentation includes either aggregated (whole group) or disaggregated (subgroup and individual student) data.	Presentation includes both aggregated (whole group) and disaggregated (subgroup and individual student) data.	
<b>Accuracy of Analysis of Data</b> [HTSB STANDARD 8]	Analysis is technically inaccurate and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.	Analysis is technically accurate but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data.	Analysis is technically accurate and conclusions are appropriate for the data.	
<b>Evidence of Impact on Student Learning</b> [HTSB STANDARD 1]	Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning.	Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning for the entire class but fails to include subgroup and individual student learning.	Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning for the entire class, subgroups, and at least two individual students.	
<b>COMMENTS:</b>				

**TEACHING PROCESS: REFLECTION AND SELF-EVALUATION (TWS Standard # 7)**

The teacher analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.

*Related University of Phoenix Program Standards (Domain and Sub-domain)*

<i>Domain One: Planning and Preparation</i> • 1D: Assessment	<i>Domain Three: Instruction</i> • 3B: Student Engagement	<i>Domain Four: The Professional Educator</i> • 4B: Professionalism • 4C: Reflection
---	--	--

**Note: An overall rating of 2.5 is required on the entire Teacher Work Sample.**

	<b>1 Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2 Basic</b>	<b>3 Proficient</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Interpretation of Student Learning</b> [HTSB STANDARD 1]	No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section.	Provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section.	Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Learning Results" section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals and objectives.	
<b>Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment</b> [HTSB STANDARD 8]	Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others.	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research).	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof.	
<b>Alignment Among Goals and Objectives, Instruction, and Assessment</b> [HTSB STANDARD 6]	Discussion shows no alignment among goals and objectives, instruction, and assessment results.	Discussion displays some sense of alignment, but misunderstandings or conceptual gaps are present.	Logically connects learning goals and objectives, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	
<b>Implications for Future Teaching</b> [HTSB STANDARD 6]	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning instruction.	Provides ideas for redesigning instruction but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides ideas for redesigning instruction and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.	
<b>Implications for Professional Development</b> [HTSB STANDARD 9]	Provides no professional learning goals or inappropriate learning goals.	Presents professional learning goals which are either vague or not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section.	Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes plans for meeting these goals.	
<b>COMMENTS:</b>				

## ***SELF-ASSESSMENT OF DISPOSITIONS***

## ***ASSESSMENT 6***

---

As Assessment #6, the *Self-Assessment of Dispositions* rubric, was aligned with only one HTSB Standard [HTSB Standard #9, *Demonstrates Professionalism*] and did not require disaggregation of comingled standards, the scoring guide for this assessment is not included in this report.

## CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT PLAN RUBRIC

## SCORING GUIDE 7A

**Note:** An overall rating of Proficient (3) is required on this artifact.

CRITERIA	1 UNSATISFACTORY	2 BASIC	3 PROFICIENT	4 ADVANCED	SCORE
Philosophy of classroom management [HTSB STANDARD 1]	No philosophy is evident.	A philosophy is evident but does not fully address classroom management.	The philosophy presented adequately relates to classroom management and is generally geared to meet the learning needs of students.	The philosophy presented is directly related to classroom management and is specifically geared to meet the learning needs of all students.	
Rules and consequences [HTSB STANDARD 2]	No rules and consequences are included.	Rules and/or consequences are included, but are not consistent with the philosophy of classroom management.  Rules and/or consequences are included, but are not appropriate for the student population.	Most rules and consequences presented are consistent with the philosophy of classroom management.  Rules and consequences presented are mostly appropriate for the student population.	Rules and consequences presented are consistent with the philosophy of classroom management.  Rules and consequences presented are appropriate for the student population.	
Task analysis of procedure [HTSB STANDARD 6]	No task analysis is included.	Task analysis is limited and does not reflect a sequence of steps.	Task analysis is adequate and suggests the use of a sequence of steps.	Task analysis is thorough and explicitly uses a sequence of steps.	
Substitute teacher plan [HTSB STANDARD 4]	No substitute teacher plan is included.	The substitute teacher plan is brief and does not provide expectations and/or routines.	The substitute teacher plan provides basic expectations and routines.	The substitute teacher plan includes detailed expectations and routines.	
Implementation plan [HTSB STANDARD 6]	No implementation plan is included or what is provided does not constitute a plan.	A limited implementation plan is included.  The plan does not provide a sequence/progression for implementing classroom management.  The implementation plan is inconsistent with the philosophy of classroom management.	The plan provides an adequate sequence/progression for implementing classroom management.  The implementation plan is generally consistent with the philosophy of classroom management.	The plan provides a logical, thorough sequence/progression for implementing classroom management.  The implementation plan is consistent with the philosophy of classroom management.	
Letter to parents [HTSB STANDARD 10]	No letter is included.	The letter does not clearly present the management plan.  The letter is poorly organized.  The letter is hard to follow due to the use of jargon and numerous grammatical and/or	The letter addresses the management plan.  The letter flows smoothly.  The letter uses minimal jargon and has few grammatical and/or typing errors.	The letter addresses the management plan.  The letter is engaging.  The letter does not use jargon and has no or almost no grammatical and/or typing errors.	



<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>1 UNSATISFACTORY</b>	<b>2 BASIC</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>4 ADVANCED</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
		typing errors.			
Strategy for Assessing Classroom Management Plan <b>[HTSB STANDARD 8]</b>	No strategy is included.	The assessment strategy does not adequately address all of the plan's elements.	An assessment strategy is included that addresses most of the plan's elements.	The assessment strategy includes multiple ways to assess the elements of the plan.	
Mechanics <b>[HTSB STANDARD 4]</b>	Spelling and grammar errors are excessive and interfere with understanding of the classroom management plan.	Spelling and grammar errors are numerous and somewhat interfere with understanding of the classroom management plan.	Spelling and grammar errors are minimal and do not interfere with understanding of the classroom management plan.	Spelling and grammar errors are not evident and do not interfere with understanding of the classroom management plan.	

ITEM #2: The unit shall report on what measures will be taken to be able to determine candidate mastery of the standards in the assessment rubrics

### **Description of Unit's Assessment System**

The unit's assessment system and specific assessments for initial programs are aligned with the University of Phoenix College of Education Conceptual Framework and national SPA standards. Alignment to the Conceptual Framework is reflected in the incorporation of framework themes (e.g., Valuing Diversity, Engaging in Reflective Practice) into specific assessments. These assessments are also aligned to reflect HTSB professional standards by aligning individual assessment criteria with single HTSB standards. Candidates must meet program outcomes that are embedded in course content and assessments; expectations for field experience and clinical practice; and program progression and completion requirements. Faculty members and advising staff monitor candidate progress to ensure that candidates are meeting program outcomes that are aligned to programmatic and Hawaii state standards.

Key assessments in the Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education include the seven benchmark assessments identified in the B.S.Ed. self-study, in addition to other program requirements. Assessments, rubrics, and evaluation tools are standardized within the B.S.Ed. program; faculty members use the same assessment criterion and evaluation tools to assess candidates, thus ensuring fairness, accuracy, and consistency within the program. Faculty use standardized electronic rubrics housed within a portfolio system called Taskstream to capture evaluations of student performance in these benchmark assessments. All faculty members have access to candidate assessment data in TaskStream.

Information on candidate performance is collected on a regular basis as candidates progress through the program. These data are evaluated to determine student mastery of the criteria identified in these assessment rubrics. Faculty members and administrators regularly review Taskstream data to determine whether candidates are achieving both programmatic and state performance standards. Because Taskstream data can be disaggregated to examine student achievement on specific rubric criteria, both faculty and college administrators have a mechanism to evaluate a student's mastery of standards aligned with assessment rubrics. Through the regular review of Taskstream rubrics and frequent analysis of disaggregated data, both faculty and administration can determine whether candidates are mastering both program and state standards.